

GEOMETRIC ALIGNMENT OF 2D GEL ELECTROPHORESIS IMAGES USING PHYSICS-BASED ELASTIC REGISTRATION

Stefan Wörz, Marie-Luise Winz, and Karl Rohr

University of Heidelberg, BIOQUANT, IPMB, and DKFZ Heidelberg,
Dept. Bioinformatics and Functional Genomics, Biomedical Computer Vision Group,
Im Neuenheimer Feld 267, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany. E-mail: s.woerz (at) dkfz.de

ABSTRACT

A key technique for protein analysis is the geometric alignment of 2D gel electrophoresis (2-DE) images. We introduce a new hybrid elastic registration approach for 2-DE images, which is based on an analytic solution of the Navier equation. With this approach cross-effects in elastic deformations can be handled, which is important for the registration of 2-DE images. We have successfully applied our approach to register 2-DE gel images of different levels of complexity and have performed a quantitative evaluation of the results. We have also carried out a comparison with a previous hybrid elastic registration scheme.

Index Terms— Hybrid elastic registration, Gaussian elastic body splines, Gel electrophoresis, Cross-effects

1. INTRODUCTION

2D gel electrophoresis (2-DE) is the method of choice for analyzing protein expression in the field of proteomics. By this technique a very large number of proteins can easily and simultaneously be separated, identified, and characterized. This is important for understanding protein function and thus enables the development of new and more effective drugs. 2-DE separates proteins based on their electrical charge and molecular mass resulting in a 2D array of dark spots (proteins) on a bright background (e.g., see Fig. 1). Often a reference population is compared with a test population to analyze the effect of medication.

To accurately and quantitatively compare the generated 2D protein profiles, three main image analysis steps are required, namely, (1) geometric alignment of 2-DE images, (2) detection of spots, and (3) quantification of spots (e.g., shape, size, contrast). For a general overview we refer to [1, 2]. In this work, we focus on the *geometric alignment* of 2-DE images. The core task is to find an optimal geometric transformation between image data, which is known as *image registration*. Due to complex physical and chemical processes, the

locations of proteins generally vary in different 2-DE images and therefore *nonrigid* or *elastic* registration schemes have to be applied (for a survey see, e.g., [3]). Severe problems in the case of 2-DE images are that the spot shapes largely differ in corresponding images, that certain spots do not appear in corresponding images, and that spots may smear over a larger area as well as overlap each other.

Previous work on *2-DE image registration* can be classified into landmark-based and intensity-based schemes. *Landmark-based* schemes first extract landmarks from the images and then compute a transformation based on these features (e.g., [4, 5]). With *intensity-based* schemes the image intensities are directly exploited to compute the transformation (e.g., [6, 7]). Moreover, hybrid approaches that combine landmark-based and intensity-based methods have been proposed, which allow to combine advantages of both types of methods (e.g., [8, 9, 10, 11]). However, with these approaches only coarse physical deformation models have been used, for example, based on B-splines [10], thin-plate splines [11], or clamped-plate splines [9], or by employing a Gaussian function for regularization of the deformation field [8]. In addition, often the intensity and landmark information are not directly combined, i.e., the intensity information is only used to locally refine the landmark-based registration result (e.g., [5]) or to estimate an affine transformation as initialization for a pure landmark-based approach (e.g., [11]).

In this contribution, we introduce a hybrid approach for the registration of 2-DE images, which is based on an improved physical deformation model using an analytic solution of the Navier equation. In contrast to previous spline-based approaches for the registration of 2-DE images (e.g., [8, 9, 11]), with this approach cross-effects in elastic deformations can be handled, which is important in the case of 2-DE images. Moreover, our approach allows to combine intensity and landmark information to aid the registration in regions which are difficult to register using intensity information alone. In contrast to [12] where brain images have been registered, we here use a different energy functional where landmark correspondences are directly incorporated instead of requiring an additional deformation field.

This work has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the project ELASTIR (RO 2471/2).




Fig. 1. Source and target 2-DE images of *easy* complexity (a,b) and *medium* complexity (c,d).

2. HYBRID ELASTIC REGISTRATION

We have developed a new hybrid approach for elastic registration of 2-DE images using both intensity and landmark information. Our approach is based on an energy minimizing functional J_{Hybrid} , which allows to compute the deformation field $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)^T$, for registering a source image g_1 with a target image g_2 . The hybrid functional comprises three energy terms $J_{Data,I}$, $J_{Data,L}$, and $J_{Elastic}$ to incorporate the intensity information, the landmark information, and the regularization of the deformation field \mathbf{u} , respectively, and reads

$$J_{Hybrid}(\mathbf{u}) = \lambda_I J_{Data,I}(g_1, g_2, \mathbf{u}) + J_{Data,L}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}, \mathbf{u} + \lambda_E J_{Elastic}(\mathbf{u}) \quad (1)$$

where λ_I and λ_E are scalar weights. To constrain the transformation to elastic deformations we chose the elastic energy $J_{Elastic}$ according to the (force-free) Navier equation $\mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\lambda + \mu) \nabla (\text{div } \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$, which represents the *regularization* of the deformation field ($\mu, \lambda > 0$ are Lamé constants describing material properties). Since the approach is based on the Navier equation, cross-effects in elastic deformations can be taken into account, i.e., a contraction in one direction leads to a dilation in orthogonal directions, which allows to model local deformations caused by the fixation of the gel.

To register images with minimal user interaction, the idea is to exploit the *intensity information* of the images as much as possible. Since in our application the images are of the same modality, we use sum-of-squared intensity differences for the intensity similarity measure $J_{Data,I}$. Moreover, our approach allows to include additional information in the form of *landmark correspondences* $(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, to aid the registration in regions which are difficult to register using intensity information alone. To include the landmark information we define $J_{Data,L}$ based on Gaussian elastic body splines (GEBS), which are analytic solutions of the Navier

equation and which have been shown to be superior compared to previously proposed elastic body splines [13]. Note that in contrast to [12], we here directly incorporate the landmark correspondences in J_{Hybrid} instead of requiring an additional deformation field. An advantage is that the intensity and landmark information can be weighted w.r.t. each other more directly and thus the weighting is easier to control.

An efficient way of minimizing J_{Hybrid} is to minimize it alternatingly w.r.t. the intensity information and w.r.t. the remaining functional. For the minimization w.r.t. the intensity information we use the method of Levenberg/Marquardt, which typically converges within few iterations. For the minimization of the overall functional we have derived an analytic solution based on the corresponding partial differential equation, which uses matrix-vector convolutions and reads

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \phi_I(\mathbf{x}) * (\mathbf{u}^I(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}) + \phi_L(\mathbf{x}) * \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_i) \mathbf{c}_i \quad (2)$$

where “*” denotes the convolution and \mathbf{G} is the matrix-valued GEBS basis function. Furthermore, \mathbf{u}^I is the result of Levenberg/Marquardt minimization and the coefficients \mathbf{c}_i are obtained from the landmark correspondences using GEBS. The matrix-valued functions ϕ_I and ϕ_L are computed based on the landmark correspondences, the GEBS basis function, as well as the values of the scalar weights λ_I and λ_E . To cope with affine differences in the images, we apply a pure intensity-based affine registration scheme [14] prior to elastic registration.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We have applied the new hybrid registration approach to register 2D polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis images of three different levels of complexity (*easy*, *medium*, and *difficult*). The images are courtesy of and have been classified by Prof. G-Z. Yang, Royal Society/Wolfson MIC Laboratory, Dept. of Computing, Imperial College of Science, Technology, and Medicine, London/UK. In each case, gel images




Fig. 2. Section of a target 2-DE image of *easy* complexity (a) as well as sections of registration results using the previous approach [8] (b) and the new approach (c).

Table 1. Quantitative evaluation results for images of *easy* complexity (208 ideally matching spots) using affine registration, a previous elastic registration approach [8], and the new approach: Number of correctly ($n_{correct}$) and incorrectly ($n_{incorrect}$) matched spots as well as fraction of correct matches.

| Approach | Information | $n_{correct}$ | $n_{incorrect}$ | Correct |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Affine [14] | intensity | 128 | 80 | 61.5% |
| Gaussian [8] | intensity | 187 | 21 | 89.9% |
| | hybrid | 201 | 7 | 96.6% |
| GEBS | intensity | 200 | 8 | 96.2% |
| | hybrid | 203 | 5 | 97.6% |

from a reference group are compared with those from a test group (see [7]). All images represent human protein expression and have a size of 1024×1024 pixels.

To analyze the performance of our approach, we have carried out a quantitative evaluation of the registration results. An obvious measure for the registration accuracy is the number of correctly matched spots. However, note that counting the spots is a non-trivial task in the case of 2-DE images, which is also tedious and time consuming. Based on spot counting we obtain the overall number of spots that should ideally match as well as the correctly and incorrectly matched spots. The quantitative evaluation has been performed for images of *easy* and *medium* complexity (see Fig. 1). Tables 1 and 2 show the resulting number of correctly matched spots ($n_{correct}$), the number of incorrectly matched spots ($n_{incorrect}$), and the fraction of correct matches.

Applying our elastic registration approach *without* using landmarks, we achieved good overall registration results for all considered 2-DE images. Only in some regions, in par-

Table 2. Same as Table 1 but for images of *medium* complexity (158 ideally matching spots).

| Approach | Information | $n_{correct}$ | $n_{incorrect}$ | Correct |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Affine [14] | intensity | 130 | 28 | 82.3% |
| Gaussian [8] | intensity | 137 | 21 | 86.7% |
| | hybrid | 149 | 9 | 94.3% |
| GEBS | intensity | 150 | 8 | 94.9% |
| | hybrid | 153 | 5 | 96.8% |

ticular, regions with a large number of tiny spots or regions located at the image border, the results are worse compared to other regions. However, by inclusion of a relatively small number of *landmarks* the registration accuracy could be significantly improved in the respective regions. Furthermore, we have quantitatively evaluated the registration results for image pairs of *easy* and *medium* complexity. For the images of *easy* complexity 208 spots should ideally match (see Table 1). Applying the new registration approach and using only *intensity information*, we obtain 200 correctly matched spots (8 incorrectly matched), which calculates to 96.2% correct matches. In contrast, the previous approach [8] yields only 187 correctly matched spots (21 incorrectly matched). A pure affine scheme leads to 128 correctly matched spots (80 incorrectly matched). By additionally incorporating eight *landmark* correspondences, the performance of the new approach improves, i.e., only 5 spots are incorrectly matched. Applying the approach in [8] using additional landmarks yields 7 incorrectly matched spots, i.e., the result is improved but worse compared to the new approach. For the images of *medium* complexity we obtained comparable results (see Table 2).

From Tables 1 and 2 it can be seen that both elastic registration approaches yield quite good results. It also turned out

that for the previous approach [8] the use of additional landmark information is crucial to achieve satisfactory matching results of 96.6% and 94.3%. In contrast, the new approach achieves this level of accuracy *without* including landmarks, and yields even better results when landmark information is used (97.6% and 96.8%). Therefore, the new approach is well suited in a fully automatic setting and the performance can be further improved when landmark correspondences are available.

Moreover, by comparing the resulting deformation grids of both elastic approaches we found that the new approach yields more realistic deformations, in particular, distortions leading to spot smearing as in the case of applying [8] are reduced. As an example, Fig. 2 shows a section (384×384 pixels) of the registered images for both elastic approaches for images of *easy* complexity. It can be seen that the new approach (c) yields a registration result without significant distortions, which is similar to the target image (a). In contrast, the previous approach [8] yields distortions leading to significant smearing, for example, see the bottom right in (b).

4. DISCUSSION

We have introduced a new hybrid elastic registration approach for the geometric alignment of 2-DE gel images. The approach is based on an analytic solution of the Navier equation. With this approach, cross-effects in elastic deformations can be handled, i.e., a contraction in one direction leads to a dilation in orthogonal directions. This allows to cope with local deformations caused by the fixation of the gel. We have successfully applied our approach to register 2-DE gel images of different levels of complexity. Moreover, the approach has been compared with a previous hybrid elastic registration approach. Based on a quantitative evaluation we found that the new approach is superior to the previous approach.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] A.W. Dowsey, M.J. Dunn, and G-Z. Yang, "The role of bioinformatics in two-dimensional gel electrophoresis," *Proteomics*, vol. 3, no. 8, pp. 1567–1596, 2003.
- [2] M. Berth, F.M. Moser, M. Kolbe, and J. Bernhardt, "The state of the art in the analysis of two-dimensional gel electrophoresis images," *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 1223–1243, 2007.
- [3] B. Zitova and J. Flusser, "Image Registration Methods: a Survey," *Image and Vision Computing*, vol. 24, pp. 977–1000, 2003.
- [4] A. Efrat, F. Hoffmann, K. Kriegel, C. Schultz, and C. Wenk, "Geometric algorithms for the analysis of 2D-electrophoresis gels," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 299–316, 2002.
- [5] M. Rogers and J. Graham, "Robust and Accurate Registration of 2-D Electrophoresis Gels Using Point-Matching," *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 624–635, 2007.
- [6] Z. Smilansky, "Automatic Registration for images of two-dimensional protein gels," *Electrophoresis*, vol. 22, pp. 1616–1626, 2001.
- [7] S. Veesser, M.J. Dunn, and G.Z. Yang, "Multiresolution image registration for two-dimensional gel electrophoresis," *Proteomics*, vol. 1, pp. 856–870, 2001.
- [8] K. Rohr, P. Cathier, and S. Wörz, "Elastic registration of electrophoresis images using intensity information and point landmarks," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 1035–1048, 2004.
- [9] M. Rogers, J. Graham, and R.P. Tonge, "2 Dimensional Electrophoresis Gel Registration Using Point Matching and Local Image-Based Refinement," in *Proc. 15th British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC'04)*, A. Hoppe, S. Barman, and T. Ellis, Eds., Kingston, UK, Sep. 2004, BMVA Press.
- [10] C.Ó.S. Sorzano, P. Thévenaz, and M. Unser, "Elastic Registration of Biological Images Using Vector-Spline Regularization," *IEEE Trans. on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 652–663, 2005.
- [11] X. Wang and D.D. Feng, "Hybrid Registration for Two-Dimensional Gel Protein Images," in *Proc. 3rd Asia-Pacific Bioinformatics Conf.*, Y.-P.P. Chen and L. Wong, Eds., Singapore, Jan. 2005, vol. 1 of *Series on Advances in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, Imperial College Press London.
- [12] S. Wörz and K. Rohr, "Hybrid Spline-Based Elastic Image Registration Using Analytic Solutions of the Navier Equation," in *Proc. Workshop Bildverarbeitung für die Medizin (BVM'07)*, A. Horsch, T.M. Deserno, H. Handels, H.-P. Meinzer, and T. Tolxdorff, Eds., Munich, Germany, March 2007, Informatik aktuell, pp. 151–155, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- [13] J. Kohlrausch, K. Rohr, and H.S. Stiehl, "A New Class of Elastic Body Splines for Nonrigid Registration of Medical Images," *J. of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 253–280, 2005.
- [14] P. Thévenaz, U.E. Ruttimann, and M. Unser, "A Pyramid Approach to Subpixel Registration Based on Intensity," *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 27–41, 1998.